



UNITED STATES DE ARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

333507

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/323,507	11/23/81	BORNZIN	G	P-552

F REED A. DUTHLER MEDTRONIC, INC., 3055 OLD HWY. 8 P. O. BOX 1453 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440

EXAMINER PAPER NUMBER DATE MAILED: 10/21/83

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

		This action is made final. from the date of this letter. S.C. 133
2 art 1 3. 5.	THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 The FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: Notice re Patent Dr Notice of informal F	awing, PTO-948. Patent Application, Form PTO-152
art II	SUMMARY OF ACTION	
1.	Claims / V	are pending in the application.
,	Of the above, claims	are withdrawn from consideration.
2.	. Claims	have been cancelled.
3.	Claims	are allowed.
4. 2	Claims	are rejected.
5. T	Claims	are objected to.
6.	Claimsare subje	ct to restriction or election requirement.
7.	This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination pu	rposes until such time as allowable subject
	matter is indicated. Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this	
8.	_	
9.	The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on These not acceptable (see explanation).	drawings are acceptable;
10.	The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explana	of drawings, filed on tion).
11.	The proposed drawing correction, filed	onsibility to ensure that the drawings are
	Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C: 119. The certified copy has	been received not been received
12.	filed on	•
12.	been filed in parent application, serial no; filed on;	and the second s
12.	Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prose accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	ecution as to the merits is closed in

Serial No. 323,507 Art Unit 335

- 1. Broken lines in Fig. 5 are objectionable, 37 CFR 1.84(i).
- 2. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

There is no further structure set forth to support a device capable of employing the specific signals claimed.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. Serial No. 323,507 Art Unit 335

- 4. Claims 1-2, 4/1, 4/2 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Zacouto.
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3 and 4/3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zacouto in view of Wictzfeld.

Serial No. 323,507 Art Unit 335

Using blood molecular oxygen level as the rate control parameter is an obvious matter of choice in view of the teaching of Wictzfeld.

7. Claims 5/1 and 5/2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zacouto in view of Greatbatch.

Control by Pwove instead of by Rwone is a mere design alternative in view of the teaching of Greatbatch.

8. Claim 5/3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zacouto in view of Wictzfeld as applied to claims 1-4 and 6-8 above, and further in view of Greatbatch.

The reason set forth above in paragraph 5 also applies here.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mr. Kamm at telephone number 703-557-3144.

W. KAMM:asj

703-557-3144

10/18/83

VII LIVER DE MARTINER
LIVER VII LIVER 255

,